Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 SALT T 00105 141459Z

45
ACTION SS-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 DODE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00

ACDE-00 /026 W
---------- 063758
P R 141345Z APR 76
FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3027
INFO AMEMBASSY MOSCOW
USMISSION NATO

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 0105

EXDIS/SALT

DEPT ALSO PASS DOD

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDS-1
TAGS: PARM
SUBJECT: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF APRIL 14, 1976 (SALT TWO-
976)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF APRIL 14, 1976.

MR. MINISTER,
I

TODAY I WILL DISCUSS FURTHER THE DEFINITION OF ICBM LAUNCHERS TO
BE CONTAINED IN PARAGRAPH 1 OF ARTICLE II OF THE JOINT DRAFT TEXT. I
BELIEVE THAT THE EXCHANGES WE HAVE HAD ON THIS SUBJECT HAVE BEEN HELPFUL

IN NARROWING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN US. TODAY I WANT TO CONTINUE THAT

EXCHANGE BY CONFIRMING THOSE AREAS WHERE WE APPEAR TO AGREE AND
FURTHER DISCUSS WITH YOU THOSE AREAS WHERE WE ARE NOT YET FULLY
IN ACCORD.
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 SALT T 00105 141459Z

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

II

AS WAS NOTED IN THE SOVIET STATEMENT OF APRIL 7, 1976, BOTH SIDES AGREE THAT ICBM LAUNCHERS WILL BE SUBJECT TO THE PROVISIONS OF THE NEW

AGREEMENT AND THAT LAND-BASED LAUNCHERS OF BALLISTIC MISSILES OF LESS THAN ICBM RANGE WILL NOT. FURTHER, THE SIDES HAVE AGREED ON A RANGE CRITERION FOR USE IN DETERMINING WHICH BALLISTIC MISSILES ARE ICBMS. HOWEVER, WE ARE NOT YET AGREED ON CRITERIA FOR USE IN DETERMINING WHICH LAUNCHERS ARE ICBM LAUNCHERS. THE US HAS PROPOSED TO CONSIDER AS ICBM LAUNCHERS ALL LAUNCHERS OF A TYPE IF A LAUNCHER OF THAT TYPE HAS EITHER CONTAINED OR LAUNCHEED AN ICBM. THE SOVIET SIDE HAS PROPOS ED
TO CONSIDER AS ICBM LAUNCHERS LAUNCHERS "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED AND DEPLOYED" FOR LAUNCHING ICBMS.

MR. MINISTER, THERE ARE SOME SIMILARITIES BETWEEN OUR TWO PRO-POSALS. FOR EXAMPLE, IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER HAS LAUNCHED A MISSILE TO ICBM RANGE DURING ITS DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING PHASE, THEN BY THE US AND APPARENTLY BY THE SOVIET FORMULATION AS WELL, THAT PARTICULAR LAUNCHER WOULD BE CONSIDERED A LAUNCHER OF ICBMS. THE SAME WOULD HOLD TRUE IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER HAD CONTAINED OR HAD BEEN DEPLOYED WITH AN ICBM. UNDER THE US FORMULATION AND APPARENTLY UNDER THE SOVIET FORMULATION AS WELL, THAT PARTICULAR LAUNCHER WOULD BE AN ICBM LAUNCHER. HOWEVER, I ALSO NOTE THAT THERE ARE AREAS
WHERE OUR APPROACHES
DO NOT AGREE. IT IS THESE AREAS THAT I WILL NOW DISCUSS.

III

THE US FORMULATION PROVIDES CRITERIA TO BE USED BY THE SIDES IN DETERMINING WHICH BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS ARE TO BE CONSIDERED LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS. FOR EXAMPLE, A SIDE COULD HAVE A NUMBER OF BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS OF DIFFERENT TYPES, SOME OF WHICH WOULD BE

SUBJECT TO INCLUSION IN THE AGGREGATE LIMITATIONS OF THE AGREEMENT AND SOME OF WHICH WOULD NOT. UNDER THE US PROPOSAL, IF ONE LAUNCHER OF

ANY OF THOSE TYPES HAD EVER CONTAINED OR LAUNCHED AN ICBM THEN ALL LALUNCHERS OF THAT TYPE WOULD BE CONSIDERED AS LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS.
SECRET

SECRET

IT IS NOT CLEAR TO THE US DELEGATION HOW THE SOVIET FORMULATION WOULD DISTINGUISH BETWEEN THOSE LAUNCHRS WHICH ARE LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS AND THOSE WHICH ARE NOT. SPECIFICALLY, UNDER THE SOVIET FORMULATION HOW WOULD A SIDE DETERMINE WHICH LAUNCHERS WERE "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED AND DEPLOYED FOR LAUNCHING ICBMS? MUST THIS DETERMINATION BE MADE FOR EACH INDIVIDUAL LAUNCHERS?

THE SOVIET STATEMENT OF APRIL 7 NOTED THAT TESTING WAS PART OF THE

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

PROCESS OF DEVELOPMENT OF ICBMS. THE US SIDES ASSUMES THAT "TESTING"
AS USED IN THE SOVIET STATEMENT, INCLUDES FLIGHT TESTING,AND THAT UNDER

THE SOVIET FORMULATION, SUCH TESTING WILL BE A CRITERION IN DETERMINING

WHICH LAUNCHERS HAVE BEEN "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED" FORLAUNCHING ICBMS.
IN THIS REGARD BOTH SIDES DEVELOP AND TEST NEW TYPES OF LAUNCHERS AND
THEIR BALLISTIC MISILES AT TEST RANGES. LAUNCHERS OF THOSE TYPES ARE
ALSO LOCATED IN OPERATIONAL UNITS; HOWEVER, FEW OF THOSE LAUNCHERS
AT OPERATIONAL UNITS HAVE EVER LAUNCHED AN ICBM. THE US PROPOSAL PROV
IDES
A LINK BETWEEN THE OBSERVED TESTING OF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER AND THE
DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER LAUNCHERS OF THAT TYPE. THUS UNDER THE US FORMU-
LATION, IF A PARTICULAR LAUNCHER CONDUCTED A TEST LAUNCH OF AN
ICBM , ALL LAUNCHER OF THAT TYPE WOLD BE CONSIDERED LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS.

UNDER THE SOVIET FORMULATION, HOW WOULD THE GAP BE BRIDGED BETWEEN
WHAT IS OBSERVED DURING TESTING AND WHAT IS OBSERVED IN THE FIELD?
MORE SPECIFICALLY, HOW DOES THE SOVIET FORMULATION DEAL WITH
DEPLOYMENT TO OPERATIONAL UNITS OF LAUNCHERS OF THE SAME TYPE
AS THOSE OBSERVED TO HAVE BEEN TESTED WITH AN ICBM?

IV

I WANT NOW TO TURN TO THE QUESTION OF BALLISTIC MISSILE LAUNCHERS
WHICH ARE ABLE TO LAUNCH BOTH ICBMS AND MISSILES OF LESS THAN ICBM
RANGE. IT IS POSSIBLE THAT A SIDE COULD DEVELOP A BALLISTIC MISSILE
LAUNCHER WHICH HAS LAUNCHED BOTH AN ICBM AND A MISSILE OF LESS THAN ICBM

RANGE, BUT DEPLOY LAUNCHERS OF THAT TYPE ONLY WITH MISSILES OF LESS
THAN ICBM RANGE. UNDER THE SOVIET FORMULATION OF "SPECIALLY DEVELOPED

SECRET

SECRET

AND DEPLOYED" IT WOULD APPEAR THAT THESE LAUNCHERS WOULD NOT BE CONSI-

DERED LAUNCHERS OF ICBMS BECAUSE THEY HAD NOT BEEN DEPLOYED FOR
LAUNCHING ICBMS. IN THIS REGARD, WE HAVE CONSIDERED THE SOVIET
PROPOSAL WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT CONVERSION OF " MISSILES LAUNCHERS,
OTHER THAN ICBM LAUNCHERS, INTO LAUNCHERS FOR LAUNCHING ICBMS. " IT
IS NOT CLEAR TO US DELEGATION HOW THIS PROHIBITION WOULD DEAL WITH
THE EXAMPLE WHICH I HAVE CITED, IN WHICH THE LAUNCHERS ARE GIVEN
THE CAPABILITY TO LAUNCH ICBMS DURING THE PROCESS OF THEIR
DEVELOPMENT AND TESTING, BUT WHICH ARE DEPLOYED ONLY WITH MISSILES
OF LESS THAN ICBM RANGE.

V

MR. MINISTER, I HAVE MADE THSE REMARKS AND ASKED THESE QUESTIONS

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

TODAY IN THE HOPE OF DRAWING OUR POSITIONS CLOSER TOGETHER. I LOOK
FORWARD TO HEARING YOUR FURTHER COMMENTS.JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: SALT (ARMS CONTROL), ARMS CONTROL MEETINGS, SPEECHES, ICBM
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 14 APR 1976
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: ShawDG
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1976SALTT00105
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: N/A
Film Number: D760141-0714
From: SALT TALKS
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1976/newtext/t19760462/aaaacaos.tel
Line Count: 172
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 4
Previous Channel Indicators: n/a
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: ShawDG
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 04 MAY 2004
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <04 MAY 2004 by CollinP0>; APPROVED <02 SEP 2004 by ShawDG>
Review Markings:

Margaret P. Grafeld
Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
04 MAY 2006

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF APRIL 14, 1976 (SALT TWO- 976)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR, (JOHNSON, U ALEXIS)
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 04 MAY 2006